

Remarks/Arguments

This paper is in response to the Office Action of October 11, 2005 and the Examiner is thanked for the careful review of this Application. The due date for response is January 11, 2006.

Claims 1, 8, 15, and 19 have been amended. Claim 19 was previously listed in prior amendments as an original claim but the language of the claim duplicated claim 20. Claim 19 has been amended to its original claim language so that it is no longer a duplicate of claim 20. Amendments were made to the claims to further clarify the inventions. The amendments do not introduce new matter. All claims not canceled are pending after entry of the present Amendment.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. section 103:

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-12, 14-15, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over East et al (East), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0061323 and further in view of Prager et al. (Prager) U.S. Patent No. 5,838,918. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

East discloses a hierarchical system and method for centralized management of thin clients. The system provides one or more administrative servers configured as a master administrative server. A master administrative server issues commands to one or more administrative servers called remote administrative servers. Thin clients are configured such that updates to configurations to the thin client are made directly either through a master administrative server or are controlled by a remote administrative server. Configuration updates are then initiated through a master administrative server.

Prager discloses a method of computer configuration management. The method employs template objects and a subscription scheme to a configuration database to establish coherent

configuration policies. As will be shown, the cited prior art references in combination do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of the independent claims.

Independent claim 1 defines a method for administration of a thin client architecture. The method provides a plurality of administrators. The method includes dividing the administrative tasks into a plurality of task groups where each task group comprises common needs of a subset of a users in a system. The dividing is achieved such that a first number of the task groups is equal to a second number of administrators. Finally, the method executes the administrative tasks.

East and Prager combined do not disclose a method of administration of a thin client architecture in which administrative tasks are divided into a plurality of task groups where each task group comprises the common needs of a discrete subset of users. East does not teach a method wherein the distributing includes dividing administrative tasks into a plurality of task groups. Prager teaches that the management-by-subscription technique allows distributed system's administrators to divide management tasks between different individuals but this is not the same as Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant's claimed invention divides tasks into task groups as part of the distributing operation. A task group is a common grouping of individual tasks into a discrete category. Prager does not teach grouping tasks as part of dividing the management tasks between different individuals.

Prager teaches distributing the administrative task among individuals without dividing the administrative tasks into tasks groups. A task group represents the common needs of a subset of users in a system. An example of this might occur when a subset of users in a system need to have their passwords reset. Prager disregards administrative tasks that may be grouped according to the common needs of a discrete subset of users. Consequently, each administrator in Prager is "fair game" for being assigned an individual task regardless of whether the task could be categorized into a group and distributed accordingly. Applicants claim a method which divides administrative

tasks into task groups where each task group comprises the common needs of a discrete subset of users in a system wherein a first number of the task groups is equal to a second number of administrators.

Independent claim 8 defines an administrative system for a thin client architecture. The system comprises a plurality of administrators who are educators of students. The students are users of a system. The system further includes a distribution mechanism configured to distribute a plurality of administrative tasks among the administrators. The distribution mechanism divides the administrative tasks into a plurality of task groups where each task group comprises the common needs of a discrete subset of users in a system and where a first number of task groups is equal to a second number of administrators. Finally, a task execution device is included which is configured to enable the administrators to execute the administrative tasks.

East and Prager combined do not disclose an administration system for a thin client architecture which provides a plurality of administrators who are the educators of students with the students being users of a system. A further distinction between the prior art combination and Applicant's claimed invention is as was stated in claim 1, that the prior art references in combination do not teach dividing administrative tasks into a plurality of task groups.

East and Prager teach administrators are managers of computer systems. This is not the same Applicant's claimed invention because managing a computer system is not the same as being an educator of a student who is a user of a system. An educator is a teacher of an academic subject and a student is one who attends classes taught by a teacher. Managing a LAN does not provide a teacher-student relationship between administrators and users of a network. As the prior art references cite, managing a LAN involves tasks such as configuring a network, updating software configurations, updating passwords, and creating accounts. (Prager col 2 lines 32-42, East [0007]) All these tasks are concerned with the management of a computer system. Without an instructive

class being taught through these activities, the administrators and users do not have a teacher-student relationship to one another. Applicant's claimed invention is directed to administrators who are educators of students.

Independent claim 15 likewise for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1 submitted to be allowable. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the East and Prager references in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed inventions. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the section 103(a) rejections with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 15 be withdrawn. In addition, the dependent claims are submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims.

With these clarifications, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6911. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP582). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Paul Link.
Registration No.53,224

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
Telephone: (408) 774-6911
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer No. 32291